PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
TASK FORCE MEETING #3
Wednesday, June 11; 7PM
Lee Recreation Center, 1108 Jefferson St

Meeting Summary

Meeting summary is developed by City staff to provide a written record of principal items of discussion and comments from the public. They are not intended to be a verbatim transcription of the meeting.

Task Force Members
Nathan Macek, Chairperson
Kerry Donley, Transportation Commission Representative
James Lewis, Traffic and Parking Board
John Gosling, Former Old Town Area Parking Study Work Group
Danielle Fidler, At-Large Alexandria Resident
Cathy Puskar, At-Large Alexandria Resident
Michael Workosky, NAIOP, The Commercial Real Estate Development Association, *Excused Absence*
Stewart Bartley, Mixed-Use Developer, *Excused Absence*

Featured Speaker
Cheryl Cort, Policy Director, Coalition for Smarter Growth

City Staff
Carrie Beach, Division Chief, P&Z
Faye Dastgheib, Principal Parking Planner, T&ES
Brandi Collins, Urban Planner III, P&Z
Jon Frederick, Housing Analyst, Office of Housing
Amy Lewis, Intern, Office of Housing

Agenda

1. Welcome & Introductions
2. Follow Up Items
3. Local and National Parking Best Practices
4. Task Force and Public Discussion
5. Next Steps

DISCUSSION
Welcome and Introductions
Nathan Macek welcomed the meeting attendees and called the meeting to order. He introduced Cheryl Cort as a guest speaker.

Follow Up Items

Faye Dastgheib provided an update on requests made by Task Force members during the previous Task Force meeting (May 14, 2014):

- Per request, the Excel Data Collection spreadsheet was emailed to all members of the Task Force.

PRESENTATION/QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Transportation Management Plan (TMP)

- More projects now are subject to TMP. The threshold is lower now than it was before. Also smaller developments can group TMPs programs or they can opt into the City's TMP. Staff will send TMP policy to group.

Shared Parking

- Phase 1 of the project is tasked with revising the parking standards for new residential development. Shared parking is not included and will be considered in Phase 2.
- Developers are usually unwilling to share parking.
- One of the challenges shared parking in a mixed-use development is designing a parking lot to accommodate diverse users (i.e. retail versus residential). This additional cost should be taken into consideration. Would need to provide detailed documentation to convince developers of the cost/benefit analysis.
- Another consideration is compact vs. non-compact retail spaces.
- Could consider hybrid arrangement. Some dedicated, some shared.
- Another driving factor is the location of the development.

Management of on street parking

- How can residential permit parking/on-street parking be better managed to impact demand/change behavior?
- Economic incentives are the way that we need to approach the on-street/off-street issues.
- Managing for availability, matching supply and demand
- There are 2 different (but related) issues when it comes to managing on street parking: 1) visitors 2) residents

Maximums and Minimums

- Many projects in Alexandria request and get parking reductions
- Parking reduction request is a misnomer because it's really just right sizing the parking because the ordinance requires too much
- City struggles with not providing too much parking, but worrying developer may not build enough
- Parking minimums need to be accompanied by on-street parking pricing management

Shared Parking

- Good local examples are: Logan Circle and Rhode Island Ave Metro
- Visitor Parking – what is the current thinking on that? Developers' experience is that they would be better off with a parking ratio that is inclusive of resident and visitor parking.

- Do not favor assigning visitor spaces
- Follow up to indicate/correct the ratios shown for DC, Arlington, and Montgomery, which are inclusive of visitor rates, including the affordable housing ratio in Arlington, form based code Arlington
- Sharing spaces is always more efficient

Additional Comments/Discussion
- Need to provide clarification on what the 50% reduction is down from in DC.
- Need to consult with the City Attorney's office to see what's implementable.
- Arlington County typical reduction usually goes to 1/unit, regardless of unit mix.
- Potomac Yard North – is ratio recommended or required?
- Visitor parking is in addition to the maximum in Beauregard.
- The parking reduction SUP is a good negotiating lever to try to achieve some other public benefits.
- Can you find a metric in the best practices showing metro accessibility?
- Alexandria is closest to Arlington in terms of conditions, or maybe on the West End more like Montgomery.
- The dynamic of transit within Alexandria is unique. Lots of commuters leaving Alexandria, lots coming in.
- King County takeaway – same as what we're finding – proximity to transit, walkability are drivers of parking demand.
- Where is the referenced Australia city located – is it close to a particular big city?

TASK FORCE DISCUSSION REGARDING NEXT STEPS
- Request staff to develop and present a sketch proposal for the Task Force to review in September. Sketch proposal should include staff's best recommendations with a few discrete alternative options (not necessarily permutations of recommendations).
- Recurring themes: proximity to transit is a prime consideration; other factors: Activity center/walkability/shopping/retail/center of employment.
- Interested in the idea of a min/max option similar to Montgomery County in defined geography. Setting thresholds with a fair amount of flexibility for developer in between to respond to market. Setting an expectation to the citizenry in terms of what to expect. A lot of angst associated with uncertainty.
- The minimum would have to be really low.
- Let staff determine whether to use a per bedroom or a per unit ratio.
- Develop additional recommendation for affordable housing.
- Ratio should be inclusive of visitor parking.
- Data on affordable housing shows that ratio is definitely lower.
- Should not codify car share.
- Staff should shorten the Best Practices list and remove cities that aren't like Alexandria; would like staff to look more at management of on-street space – as a subset of main charge of the group. Also would like to further study mixed-use/shared parking.
- Whatever best model staff comes up with using the Australia performance-based model, staff should validity test the data using that system. Reverse engineer from the data.
- Could be compared to slide 13 – Alexandria. Under each scenario how much parking would have to be built. Use the same hypothetical development.

- Use the data gathered to draw the reduced parking areas on the map. But understanding that things are going to change, it may be better to have a model (like the Australia performance-based system) that is flexible.
- Need to clarify the method for how distance to metro is measured; if that is going to be one of the performance-based criteria.
- Reflect walking paths in determining proximity to metro.
- More research or thought is needed on how to change the RPP in those areas where people do not have access to off-street parking. Make sure the proposal takes into account these areas – how to mitigate for the existing residents.
- Let's look at the neighborhoods that don't have off-street parking that fall within a ¼ or ½ mile walkshed of metro stations. We need to note that this could potentially be an effect of a proposed change. We can determine the extent of the issue – areas affected and the extent of the problem. Maybe in those areas, you don't allow the unbundling.
- If we support unbundling, then we need to be prepared to defend it.

SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE DIRECTION TO STAFF
Develop draft policy that focuses on access to:

- Metro stations (within 1/4- and 1/2-mile distance)
- High-frequency bus transit
- Walkable urban amenities

  - Make standards inclusive of visitor parking
  - Develop companion parking standard for affordable housing
  - Consider specifying minimum and maximum parking requirements.
  - Consider a parking ratio based on unit; not bedroom size (staff will actually consider both)
  - Consider a performance-based approach
  - Do not codify a car share requirement
  - Examine impact of unbundling parking on on-street parking in RPP districts

TEST the Proposed Policy by developing a hypothetical development ("500 units, X 1BR, X 2BR, X% affordable") and compare parking spaces required under existing City standards to the proposed policy. Work to validate draft policy based on collected data.